

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed June 25, 2004. In order to advance prosecution of the present Application, Claims 1, 3, 9; and 11-14 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

The drawings stand objected to for a minor informality. The examiner indicates that Applicant's specification indicates "local buffer" at page 6, line 21. However, upon review of Applicant's specification the recitation reads "local block" at page 6, line 21, which is consistent with the referenced part in FIGURE 2. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the drawings are accurate.

Claims 1-8 stand objected to for minor informalities. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to address the informalities identified by the Examiner.

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson, et al. Independent Claim 9 recites language from original Claim 11 where the get message requests a latest copy of a line. The Examiner has indicated that the Anderson, et al. patent does not disclose such limitation. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 9 and 10 are not anticipated by the Anderson, et al. patent.

Claims 9-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Brayton, et al. Independent Claim 9 recites ". . . a get message operable to communicate across partitions from a requesting node controller to a storing node controller, the get message requesting a latest copy of a line to be sent to the requesting node controller in a particular partition, the particular partition not maintaining coherency of the line." By contrast, the Brayton, et al. patent requires that coherency be maintained at all times for all

data in all clusters of its system. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 9-14 are not anticipated by the Brayton, et al. patent.

Applicant notes with appreciation the allowability of Claims 1-8 if amended to address the informalities raised by the Examiner. As discussed above, Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to address the informalities raised by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-8 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicants



Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

September 24, 2004

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, TX 75201-2980
(214) 953-6507
Customer Number: 05073